

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Objections and/or Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to. Claims 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 24, 63, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 24-25, 63-64, and 68-69, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

III. The Specification

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for *first business logic component* and *second business logic component*. Accordingly, the Claims have been amended to claim a base user class and an extended user class, support for which can be found in paragraphs [0028] and [0029] of the Specification. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008, Claims 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Specifically, it was submitted that Claims 68-73 were directed to a system comprising software per se. Accordingly, Claim 68 has been amended and it is respectfully submitted that Claims 68-73 now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008, Claims 24, 63, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, it was submitted in the Office Action that the claim limitation *such that the property set can differentiate properties with a single name* was not described in the Specification. Accordingly, Claims 24, 63, and 68 have been amended to claim *such that the property set can differentiate multiple properties that share a single property name*, which is supported by paragraph [0033] of the Specification. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Underwood. Applicants do not agree with this rejection and believes that these claims were not anticipated nor made obvious by Underwood. However, to expedite issuance of a patent, Applicants have amended these claims.

Claim 24

Claim 24 has been amended to require generating a unified user profile by creating an extended user class to extend the base user class such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be, by using methods inherited by the extended user class from the base user class, transparently retrieved from and updated in, using the extended user class, both the personalization database and an external user database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database.

In the Office Action, Underwood was cited as creating a second business logic component to extend the first business logic component because Underwood discloses a AFUserDB component to access information maintained through one set of database tables and a AFUserSS component to access user information maintained through a SiteServer.

However, because the AFUserDB and AFUserSS components are related only in that they both are used to access user data (col. 51, lines 55-62), the AFUserDB and AFUserSS

components do not inherit methods from one another. In contrast, Claim 24, as amended, requires that the extended user class extends base user class and *inherits* methods from base user class (see paragraph [0044] of the Specification), thus more clearly defining the close relationship between the base user class and the extended user class.

Furthermore, while the AFUserDB and AFUserSS components are each used to access a different database or server, Claim 24, as amended, requires that the extended user class can be used to transparently retrieve properties from *both* an external user database *and* the personalization database, instead of needing to use two separate classes to access two databases.

Thus, because the components disclosed in Underwood do not inherit methods from one another, and because both of the two components are needed in order to access all of the separate databases and servers, Underwood does not disclose the step of generating a unified user profile, as required by Claim 24, as amended.

Claim 24 has also been amended to require that the unified user profile allows the user or application to access data in the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of whether the accessed data is in the personalization database or the external user database.

In the Office Action, Underwood was cited as disclosing allowing access to data independent of any knowledge of the data's location because Underwood discloses a set of methods for the AFUserDB and AFUserSS components used to access data (col. 52, lines 10-24 and 35-53). However, a user using those disclosed methods would still have to know which database or server the user wants to access because the user has to specifically call a method of the AFUserDB component in order to access one set of database tables and to specifically call a method of the AFUserSS component in order to access a SiteServer. Thus, even with the set of methods disclosed in Underwood, a user would still have to know which database or server he wishes to access. In contrast, Claim 24, as amended, requires that the user or application may access data independent of any knowledge of whether that data is stored in one database or the other.

Thus, because users using the methods discussed in Underwood would still need to know which database or server they wish to access, Underwood does not disclose that the unified user

profile allows the user or application to access data in the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of whether the accessed data is in the personalization database or the external user database, as required by Claim 24, as amended.

Claim 24 has also been amended to require a property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of data in a personalization database such that the property set differentiates multiple properties that share a single property name.

In the Office Action, Underwood was cited as disclosing that each method has its own single name, and no method has a same name with other methods (col. 52, lines 35-53). While Underwood discusses methods of components that are called to access data in a database or server, the property set required in Claim 24 is directed towards differentiating the properties of data in a database rather than differentiating the methods used to access that data. Furthermore, the mere fact that data access methods of Underwood have different names does not show how multiple properties that share a single property name is differentiated from one another, as required by Claim 24, as amended.

Thus, Underwood does not disclose a property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of data in a personalization database such that the property set differentiates multiple properties that share a single property name, as required by Claim 24, as amended.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 24 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 63 and 68

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 24, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 63 and 68, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the features that they require. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 9, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800